

To:

Date:

Re:

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY MEMORANDUM

30 May 70

Harold —

I received the Bow Street "notes" today from Bud. I see nothing here that is not available from newspapers. Indeed, it's possible even to suggest that these "notes" were derived from press accounts.

I may have mentioned this to you previously, but consider it important enough to reiterate. I call your attention to "Sneyd's" statement that Butler's account of Butler-Sneyd confrontation is false: no "Oh, God; I feel so trapped", and stuff like that. In effect, "Sneyd" called Butler a liar. Why? Sneyd's assertion served his interest in no way whatever; he had nothing to gain by this, and everything to lose.

Suppose, after all, that both Butler and

To:

2

Date:

Re:

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY MEMORANDUM

"Sneyd" were telling the truth: that the confrontation did not occur between Butler and the Sneyd who appeared at Bow Street Court, but between Butler and "the other Sneyd", who did not appear at Bow Street. Considering other factors which indicate two Sneyds (and maybe two arrests), I think this court statement gives added support to the notion of two Sneyds.

The court statements make no sense to me otherwise. Either Butler or "Sneyd" lied, or else both were telling the truth. And I cannot figure why either one would lie over this seemingly pointless matter.

To:

3.

Date:

Re:

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY MEMORANDUM

It boils down to this: Butler said,
"I confronted a man known to me as
Sneyd, and he did such-and-such";
"Sneyd" said: "Butler did not confront
me."

If you think that this ~~then~~ suggests
something other than two Sneyds, then
can you reasonably explain why Butler
or "Sneyd" would lie over this unimportant
matter?

Still,

Sick